UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,375	06/18/2001	Anton Oguzhan Alford Andrews	PHN-17.707	8890

24737 7590 12/07/2007

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
VU, THANH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/868,375	ANDREWS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THANH T. VU	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *35-69 and 71-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *35-41,45,46 and 62-64* is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *42-44, 47-52, 60, 61, 65-68 and 71-74* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *53,59 and 69* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 09/20/2007.

Claims 35-69, and 71-74 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claim 70 was added, and claims 42-48, 53, 54, 57, 59-61, 65, 71, and 73 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 66-68, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 66 recites "said touch screen directly abuts a part of the table top". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

Claims 67 and 68 recite "said touch screen extends to an outer part of said table top". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

Claim 72 recites "said touch screen is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 42-44, 47, 49, 50, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621) and Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432).

Per claim 42, Nawaz teaches an information processing device for exploring information by a user, comprising:

a display screen to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-23 and 34-44; *the examiner interprets flowing links to be scrolling list of data items are being display in a flow zone 142 of*

fig. 3; each data items (or links) is linked to respective information and the user can select the link to display the respective information, see col. 3, lines 50-55; col. 9, lines 20-25).

Although, Nawaz suggests data items can be scrolled at variable speeds and scrolled in different directions horizontally or vertically (see, col. 8, lines 42-50) and the data items can be displayed in a an application window (see, col. 9, lines 55-62), Nawaz does not specifically teach a controller that is configured to selectively change flow speed and flow direction based on locations of user input events within the flow zone. However, Yamada teaches a controller (*mouse of fig. 5*) to selectively change the flow speed and flow direction based on locations of user input events within the flow zone (figs 6-7; *fig. 7 shows scrolling of information within an application window or frame;* col. 18, lines 20-47 *shows scrolling speed and scrolling direction (i.e. flow speed and flow direction) are changed based on mouse cursor's moving from one location to another within the window or frame (i.e. location of user input events within the flow zone)*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a controller as taught by Yamada in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a control option to directly adjust speed of the scrolling data items within a display window and visually provide scrolling speed.

Per claim 43, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, wherein the flowing links move at a default none zero flow speed and a default flow direction within the flow zone (Nawaz, *data item are scrolled at a default speed and in a certain direction* see, col. 8, lines 42-50), and user input event selectably change the flow speed or flow direction (Yamada, col. 18, lines 20-47; *a mouse is used to selectable change a flow speed or flow direction*).

Per claim 44, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 43. Yamada further teaches a user operable point-and-select device for providing the input events including selecting a location within the flow zone (*clicking of input device for selecting a specific location* see col. 12, lines 36-44), and flow of the flowing links within the flow zone is stoppable in response to the user statically selecting a location within the flow zone with the user operable point-and-select device (*it is inherent that scrolling is stoppable when the user selecting a location by moving the mouse 200 to the initial located display (initial coordinate) because the scroll speed is relative to the initial display (initial coordinate)*, see col. 18, lines 27-31).

Per claim 47, the modified Nawaz an information processing device according to claim 43, wherein the flow zone is arranged to alternately display the links and flow control areas (Nawaz; *ticker display pane 142 of fig. 3 displays links (e,g, 150 and 152 ect.), each link represents a control area because it is select by the user (see col. 9, lines 20-25)*, and the flow is controlled by selecting the flow control areas with the input device (Yamada, *user can select a location within a window frame and control the scrolling speed or direction,* see col. 12, lines 36-44 and col. 18, lines 20-45).

Per claim 49, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, further comprising: a filtering unit including a plurality of user selectable filters for controlling the flow zone to display links to information units which meet a requirement imposed by a selected filter (Nawaz, col. 9, lines 37-54; *customization of content provided in the viewer 142 of fig. 3*).

Per claim 50, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 49, wherein the filtering unit adapts the selected filter to display links to information units

similar to the related information unit (Nawaz, col. 9, lines 37-54; *a user can customize the content provided in the viewer 142 of fig. 3*).

Claims 60 and 61 individually are rejected under the same rationale as claim 42.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652).

Per claim 48, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42 having information related to data item or link is displayed when selected (see col. 3, lines 51-55 and col. 9, lines 20-25) but does not teach wherein a presentation of the content from the related information unit is initiated by a user input event that includes dragging a selected link to the presentation zone. However, Barraus teaches dragging a link to a browser window will automatically retrieve the webpage related to the link (fig. 15; steps 1508-1512; col. 25, line 56-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Barraus in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to provide the user with automatically displaying of a web page related to a link by dragging the link to a browser window.

Claims 51 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432) and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,832,350).

Per claims 51 and 54, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone. However, Bates teaches a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone (fig. 4 and fig. 14, col. 9, lines 53-67; *user can maintain a plurality of preferred use-links and display the user links in a window by creating bookmarks*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Bates in the invention of the Nawaz in order to provide the user with a method for creating bookmarks and organizing and presenting such bookmark.

Per claim 54, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 51, wherein a frequency of display of an information unit in the flow zone is determined by an age and/or popularity of the information unit (Nawaz, col. 9, lines 37-54; col. 8, lines 62-57; *since the data items are being displayed in rotation one after another, the users can set how often they want to see a data item by choosing more or less number of content providers to source the data items*).

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), and Glaser (U.S. pat. No. 6,392,671).

Per claim 52, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 51, comprising the user-link unit for sorting and/or retrieving the preferred user-links (Bates; fig. 4 and fig. 14, col. 9, lines 53-67; *user can maintain a plurality of preferred use-links*

and by using bookmarks), but does not teach further comprising: a detector for communicating with a user supplied data carrier in response to control by the user-link unit for retrieving the user personal preferences (col. 2, lines 38-45; col. 5, lines 27-33; *a mouse with memory for storing user personal preferences*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Glaser in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to automatically transport user preferences from one computer system to another computer system.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934).

Per claim 55, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach a table for supporting the display screen. However Flutka teaches a table for supporting the display screen (fig. 1; see Abstract; col. 2, lines 45-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Flutka in the invention of Nawaz in order to improve the health of the computer operator and to provide for an unimpeded forward line of sight by the computer operator.

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Naidoo (U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,136).

Per Claim 56, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device. However, Naidoo teaches the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device (col. 2, lines 21-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen that is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Naidoo in the invention of Nawaz in order to automatically provide information content to the user based on location of the user's device.

Claims 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767).

Per claims 57 and 58, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach wherein the display screen and the controller are embodied as part of a portable device, and wherein the portable device is a hand-held device. However, Ku teaches wherein the display screen and the controller are embodied as part of a portable device, and wherein the portable device is a hand-held device (col. 2, lines 25-29, col. 4, lines 36-41; col. 5, lines 6-15; *portable computer with input device*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a user with a portable computer which is lightweight and convenient to transport.

Claims 65, 67, 68, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919), and Yamada.

Per claim 65, Nawaz teaches a display screen comprising:

a graphical user interface having a plurality of user responsive display elements for displaying on the display screen (fig 3, *ticker display viewer with plurality display elements or links,* see col. 8, lines 14-22), the responsive display elements comprising:

a flow zone comprising a list of flowing links displayed around a periphery of the display screen (*the examiner considers the list of flowing links to be scrolling list of links, see col. 8, lines 14-23 and lines 34-44. This list of links are display around the top edge of the desktop 104 of fig. 3 and it can be displayed around the right edge of the desktop see fig. 10)*; and

a presentation zone for presenting information selected from the flowing links as a presentation (see col. 3, lines 51-56 and col. 9, lines 20-25; *user can select a link from the scrolling links to be displayed. Such display is considered as a presentation in a presentation zone (e.g. browser display of fig. 11)*).

Although Nawaz teaches a display screen for displaying said graphical user interface, Nawaz does not specifically teach the display screen is a touch screen and a table comprising a table top and display screen occupies a portion of a table top and a controller that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for altering a flow rate of the flowing links. However, Ku teaches a computer with touch-screen technology (col. 2, lines 25-29; and col. 5, lines 1-15; *a computer with a touch sensitive screen*). Nevin teaches a table comprising a table top and display screen occupies a portion of a table top (see fig. 1; *a table with display screen built-in).*

Yamada teaches a controller (*mouse of fig. 5*) that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for altering flow rate of the flowing links (figs 6-7; *fig. 7 shows scrolling of information within an application window or frame;* col. 18, lines 20-47 *shows scrolling speed (ie. flow speed) is changed based on mouse cursor's moving from one location to another within the window or frame (i.e. user input events within the flow zone)*)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the computer with a touch-screen as taught by Ku, a table with a built-in display as taught by Nevin and a controller as taught by Yamada in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide the user with a portable computer that is enhanced with a touch screen technology which allows the user directly enter data directly through the touch sensitive screen a, in order to provide the user with a desk or a table with a built-in display which is mounted so that it can be moved to an appropriate viewing position relative to the work surface, when required, and in order to provide a control option to directly adjust speed of the scrolling data items within a display window and visually provide scrolling speed.

Per claim 67, the modified Nawaz teaches a table according to claim 65. Nevin further teaches where said touch screen extends to an outer part of said table top (fig. 1; *the examiner considers the surface surrounding the display screen as an outer part of the table top. In fig 1, the left side or right side of the display screen 14 extends to an outer part of the table top).*

Per claim 68, the modified Nawaz teaches a table according to claim 67, said touch screen is enclosed in said table top by said outer part (fig. 5, *the display screen is enclosed is enclosed in said table top by said outer part*).

Claim 71 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 65.

Per claim 72, the modified Nawaz teaches a table according to claim 71. Nevin further teaches said touch screen is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side (figs. 5 and 6; *the display screen is shown disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side)*.

Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919) and McNelly et al. ("McNelly", U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,130).

Per claim 66, the modified Nawaz a table according to claim 65 having a table with a built-in touch screen as described above. The modified Nawaz does not specifically teach said touch screen is directly abuts a part of said table top, and said touch screen is disposed horizontally in said table top and flush with areas of said table top surrounding said touch screen. However, McNelly teaches a display that is being built into a table wherein the screen is directly abuts a part of said table top (col. 8, lines 32-33; *a display screen is being built into a table the screen surface flush (or abut) with table surface*), and is disposed horizontally in said table top and flush with areas of said table top surrounding said touch screen (col. 8, lines 32-33; *a display screen is being built into a table the screen surface flush with table surface*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the a display screen is being built into a table the screen surface flush with table surface as taught by McNelly in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to provide the user with a different viewing angle of a display screen in which the display screen surface is flush with the table

surface. This viewing angle would be advantageous in a classroom setting because this would give a better line of sight between an instructor and his of her student.

Claims 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919).

Per claim 73, Nawaz teaches an information processing device comprising:

a display screen to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-23 and 34-44; *the examiner interprets flowing links to be scrolling list of data items are being display in a flow zone 142 of fig. 3; each data items (or links) is linked to respective information and the user can select the link to display the respective information,* see col. 3, lines 50-55; col. 9, lines 20-25); and an input device responsive to control by the user to directly alter the flow of the links and to select one of the flowing links (*a user can alter the flow of the links by select variable speeds through a control menu, and select one of the flowing links,* col. 8, lines 44-47 and col. 9, lines 20-25).

Nawaz does not specifically teach a table comprising an upper and substantially horizontal table side and a display screen is disposed horizontally in said upper table side, a controller that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for altering a flow rate of the flowing links. Nevin teaches teach a table comprising an upper and substantially horizontal table side and a display screen is disposed horizontally in said upper table side (figs. 5 and 6; *the display screen is shown disposed horizontally in an upper table side).* Yamada teaches a controller (*mouse of fig. 5*) that is responsive to user input events within the flow zone for

altering flow rate of the flowing links (figs 6-7; *fig. 7 shows scrolling of information within an application window or frame;* col. 18, lines 20-47 *shows scrolling speed (ie. flow speed) is changed based on mouse cursor's moving from one location to another within the window or frame (i.e. user input events within the flow zone)*)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a table with a built-in display as taught by Nevin in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide the user with a desk or a table with a built-in display which is mounted so that it can be moved to an appropriate viewing position relative to the work surface, when required, and in order to provide a control option to directly adjust speed of the scrolling data items within a display window and visually provide scrolling speed

Claims 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919) and Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919).

The modified Nawaz teaches the table according to claim 73, the display screen and the input device cooperated to form a graphical user interface, and the plurality of flowing links within the flow zone are user responsive display elements displayed around a periphery of the screen (Nawaz, *the examiner considers the list of flowing links to be scrolling list of links, see col. 8, lines 14-23 and lines 34-44. This list of links are display around the top edge of the desktop 104 of fig. 3 and it can be displayed around the right edge of the desktop see fig. 10).*

The modified Nawaz does not specifically teach the display screen is a touch screen. However, Ku teaches a computer with touch-screen technology (col. 2, lines 25-29; and col. 5, lines 1-15; *a computer with a touch sensitive screen*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the computer with a touch-screen as taught by Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide the user with a portable computer that is enhanced with a touch screen technology which allows the user directly enter data directly through the touch sensitive screen.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 35-41, 45-46 and 62-64 are allowed.

Claims 53, 59, and 69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art either alone or in combination doesn't teach the limitation of "a flow control means responsive to appropriate strokes made on the touch screen by the user within the flow zone to selectively change flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links" as recited in claim 35 in combination with the other claimed features.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument is "that there is no apparent reason for combining the teachings of Nawaz and Yamada because the principles taught by each are substantially incompatible with each other" (page 12 of Remarks).

The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

Nawaz suggests data items can be scrolled at variable speeds and scrolled in different directions horizontally or vertically (see, col. 8, lines 42-50). In addition, the data items can be displayed in an application window (see, col. 9, lines 55-62). Yamada teaches a controller (*mouse of fig. 5*) to selectively change the flow speed and flow direction based on locations of user input events within the flow zone (figs 6-7; *fig. 7 shows scrolling of information within an application window or frame;* col. 18, lines 20-47 *shows scrolling speed and scrolling direction (ie. flow speed and flow direction) are changed based on mouse cursor's moving from one location to another within the window or frame (i.e. location of user input events within the flow zone)*). In this case, both Nawaz and Yamada teach scrolling of data items within an application window. However, Yamada the teaches a specific method of using a mouse control means to selectively change the scrolling speed and scrolling direction of data items within an application window. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the scrolling control means in an application window as taught by Yamada in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a control option to directly adjust speed of the scrolling data items within a display of an application window and visually provide scrolling speed (see, col. 1, line 10-15).

As for claims 66-68, the applicant points out that limitations for claims 66-68 are clearly described at page 6, lines 14-17. The examiner does not agree because page 6, lines 14-17 only

describes a table with a built-in touch screen. There are no specific explanations of how the touch-screen is being built or positioned into the table.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THANH T. VU whose telephone number is (571)272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. T. V./
Examiner, Art Unit 2174

/David A Wiley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174